

Generic I0 at $\aleph_\omega$

Vincenzo Dimonte*

September 27, 2016

Abstract

In this paper it is introduced a generic large cardinal akin to I0, and its consequences are analyzed in the case that $\aleph_\omega$ is such a generic large cardinal. In this case $\aleph_\omega$ is Jónsson, and in a choiceless inner model many properties hold that are in contrast with PCF in ZFC.

Keywords: Generic large cardinal, elementary embedding, Jónsson cardinal, ω -strongly measurable cardinal, I0.

2010 Mathematics Subject Classifications: 03E05, 03E35, 03E55 (03E45)

1 Introduction

As there is no specific definition of the notion of large cardinal, we can expect the same for generic large cardinals. Yet one can identify some vague pattern: All the large cardinals of a certain strength are of the form $j : V \prec M$, where j is an elementary embedding and M is an inner model of V with some closure properties; therefore we call generic large cardinals those of the form $j : V \prec M \subseteq V[G]$, where M is an inner model of some generic extension of V . We can date back the origin of generic large cardinals to the introduction by Solovay of the generic ultrapower, and then to the definition by Jech and Prikry in [10] of the precipitous ideal, whose generic ultrapower gives exactly the situation described above. Of course, different generic large cardinals can be described varying how “close” is $V[G]$ from V (for example whether class forcing is permitted or not), how large is the critical point, and even considering variations that stray from the pattern but are conceptually close.

The advantage of generic large cardinals is that their critical point can be small (for example ω_1), therefore they are a tool to transfer properties of large cardinal to “accessible” cardinals. This works best for model-theoretical combinatorial properties, as the elementary embedding yield some reflection structure. For example:

Definition 1.1. *Given $\gamma_0, \gamma_1, \eta_0, \eta_1$ cardinals, we write $(\gamma_0, \gamma_1) \twoheadrightarrow (\eta_0, \eta_1)$ to indicate that every model in a first-order language with one relation symbol $\mathcal{U} = (U, R)$ such that $|U| = \gamma_0$ and $|R| = \gamma_1$ has an elementary submodel $\mathcal{V} = (V, S)$ such that $|V| = \eta_0$ and $|S| = \eta_1$.*

*E-mail address: vincenzo.dimonte@gmail.com (Vincenzo Dimonte)

KURT GÖDEL RESEARCH CENTER, University of Vienna, Währinger Straße 25, A-1090 Vienna, Austria

Chang's Conjecture is $(\aleph_2, \aleph_1) \rightarrow (\aleph_1, \aleph_0)$. It is also possible to consider in the definition two, three, etc... relation symbols. Such structure is common in very large cardinals:

Definition 1.2. *A cardinal κ is huge iff there exists $j : V \prec M$ such that κ is the critical point of j and $M^{j(\kappa)} \subseteq M$.*

A cardinal κ is n -huge iff there exists $j : V \prec M$ such that κ is the critical point of j and $M^{j^n(\kappa)} \subseteq M$.

If κ is huge then for any $\gamma < \kappa$, $(j(\kappa), \gamma) \rightarrow (\kappa, \gamma)$, and Kunen exploited this to prove Chang's Conjecture via a collapse of a huge cardinal (into a generic huge cardinal). Laver remarked that the same collapse can be used to prove $(\aleph_{n+2}, \aleph_{n+1}) \rightarrow (\aleph_{n+1}, \aleph_n)$. A more sophisticated collapse of a 2-huge cardinal was used in [8] to prove $(\aleph_{n+3}, \aleph_{n+2}, \aleph_{n+1}) \rightarrow (\aleph_{n+2}, \aleph_{n+1}, \aleph_n)$.

The dream is to push this to its limit:, by a theorem of Silver, if $(\dots, \aleph_3, \aleph_2, \aleph_1) \rightarrow (\dots, \aleph_2, \aleph_1, \aleph_0)$, then $\aleph_\omega$ is Jónsson. It is a long-standing open problem whether $\aleph_\omega$ can be Jónsson, so proving this would be highly desirable. Unfortunately, the "limit" of hugeness is actually inconsistent (the same proof for the inconsistency of the Reinhardt cardinal holds). Interestingly, also its generic counterpart is inconsistent: if $\aleph_\omega = j^\omega(\text{crt}(j))$ and $M^{\aleph_{\omega+1}} \subseteq M$, then $\aleph_{\omega+1}$ is Jónsson (see Remark 2.10), but Shelah proved that $\aleph_{\omega+1}$ cannot be Jónsson, using PCF theory. Yet there are large cardinals between n -huge and Reinhardt:

Definition 1.3. • *I1: there exists λ such that $\exists j : V_{\lambda+1} \prec V_{\lambda+1}$;*

• *I0: there exists λ such that $\exists j : L(V_{\lambda+1}) \prec L(V_{\lambda+1})$, with $\text{crt}(j) < \lambda$.*

I0 in particular is very fruitful in consequences, as it gives to $L(V_{\lambda+1})$ a structure that is very similar to the structure of $L(\mathbb{R})$ under the Axiom of Determinacy, in a way that it is still not completely understood. NOW, the "right" versions of generic I1 and generic I0 (see Definition 3.1) prove that $\aleph_\omega$ is Jónsson. Moreover, this paper presents other results, in line with the results about I0. In short, under generic I0 the structure of $L(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))$ is similar to the structure of $L(\mathbb{R})$ under the AD:

Theorem 1.4. *Suppose that generic I0 holds at $\aleph_\omega$. Then $\aleph_\omega$ is Jónsson. Moreover, in $L(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))$ (see below for all the definitions):*

- $\aleph_{\omega+1}$ is ω -strongly measurable and Jónsson;
- Θ is "inaccessible", in the sense that it is regular and if $\alpha < \Theta$ then there is a surjection from $\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega)$ to $\mathcal{P}(\alpha)$;
- Θ is limit of ω -strongly measurable cardinals.

Some of these results are not new. A model where $\aleph_{\omega+1}$ is a measurable cardinal was already known:

Theorem 1.5 (Martin). *AD implies $\aleph_{\omega+1}$ is measurable.*


Theorem 1.6 (Apter, [1]). *Suppose κ is 2^λ -supercompact, with λ measurable. Then there is a model of $\text{ZF} + \aleph_{\omega+1}$ is measurable.*

New is the Jónsson-ness of $\aleph_{\omega+1}$, that goes strongly against Shelah's result, but this is not surprising, as under generic I0 $L(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))$ does not satisfy the Axiom of Choice, and PCF theory has not been fully developed in this setting. But in fact, Theorem 4.1 goes very strongly against a more celebrated result of PCF theory:

Theorem 1.7 (Shelah, [12]). *If $\aleph_\omega$ is strong limit, then $2^{\aleph_\omega} < \aleph_{\omega_4}$.*

In Theorem 4.1, Θ can be seen as a measure of $2^{\aleph_\omega}$ in a choiceless setting: it is drastically larger than the cap given by Shelah's theorem, as it is an inaccessible limit of measurable cardinals. Generic I0 therefore not only proves that $\aleph_\omega$ is Jónsson, but provides a model where PCF theory fails radically.

In this paper no attempt is made to prove the consistency of generic I0. Currently it is not even known whether generic 3-huge is consistent, as Foreman's technique meets difficult technical obstacles in its generalization. This is the graph indicating current knowledge, framed are the new results (between parentheses the hypotheses that are inconsistent with ZFC):



2 Preliminaries

This paper is about $L(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))$. The assumption is that there is a V in which ZFC holds, and $L(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))$ is constructed inside V , as the smallest model of ZF that contains the ‘real’ $\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega)$. The construction is the same as L , but the starting point of the construction is $L_0(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega)) = \mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega)$, and the levels $L_\alpha(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))$ are defined as expected.

Even if AC holds in V , it does not necessarily hold in $L(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))$. Yet some relatively strong weak form of choice is inherited:

Definition 2.1. DC_λ : $\forall X \forall F : (X)^{<\lambda} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(X) \setminus \emptyset \quad \exists g : \lambda \rightarrow X \quad \forall \gamma < \lambda \quad g(\gamma) \in F(g \upharpoonright \gamma)$.

Remark 2.2 (ZF + $DC_{\aleph_\omega}$). $L(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega)) \models DC_{\aleph_\omega}$

Sketch of proof. The proof exploits the fact that there exists a surjection $\Phi : \text{Ord} \times \mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega) \rightarrow L(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))$: $DC_{\aleph_\omega}$ is true on $\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega)$ as it is true in V , on Ord

because Ord is well-ordered, and Φ mixes the two to carry $\text{DC}_{\aleph_\omega}$ in all $L(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))$. $\square$

In a choiceless model the concept of cardinality is notoriously more complex. As in $L(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))$ the Axiom of Choice holds up to $\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega)$, the first problematic point is how to characterize the cardinality of $\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega)$. In $L(\mathbb{R})$ the classical way is to calculate it via surjections instead of the usual bijections, and we borrow the same idea. Surjections in this paper are always noted with the symbol $\rightarrow$.

Definition 2.3. $\Theta^{L(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))} = \{\alpha : \exists \pi : \mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega) \rightarrow \alpha\}$.

For the rest of the paper, $\Theta^{L(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))} = \Theta$, as this will not create confusion. It is routine to prove that Θ is regular in $L(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))$, see for example Exercise 28.19 in [11].

The cardinal Θ is central in the study of the subsets of $\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega)$:

Lemma 2.4 (Folklore). *If $X \in L(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))$, $X \subseteq \mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega)$, then $X \in L_\Theta(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))$.*

For this reason models like $L_\alpha(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))$ with $\alpha < \Theta$ are also relevant in the study of the subsets of $\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega)$, as they form a well-ordered set of approximations of $L_\Theta(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))$. We say that an ordinal $\alpha < \Theta$ is *good* iff every element of $L_\alpha(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))$ is definable in $L_\alpha(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))$ from an element in $\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega)$. Good ordinals in $L(V_{\lambda+1})$ were introduced by Laver in [9], and they are described in more details in [6].

Lemma 2.5. *If $\aleph_\omega$ is strong limit, then there are unbounded good ordinals below Θ .*

Sketch of proof. As in the $L(V_{\lambda+1})$ case. The key point is that $\aleph_\omega$ is strong limit, therefore $\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega)$ can be considered closed by ω -sequences.

Let $\beta_0 < \Theta$. Then the surjection $h_0 : \mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega) \rightarrow L_{\beta_0}(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))$ is in some minimal $L_{\beta_1}(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))$, and is definable from some parameter a_0 . By induction define h_n, β_n and a_n in the obvious way, and it is routine to check that if β_ω is the supremum of the β_n 's, then there exists $h : \mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega) \rightarrow L_{\beta_\omega}(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))$ that is definable from $\langle a_0, \dots, a_n, \dots \rangle \in \mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega)$, and therefore β_ω is good. $\square$

Large cardinals are also problematic in choiceless models. Fortunately, the definition of ‘measurable’ still holds in ZF without AC. But the study of $L(\mathbb{R})$ under the Axiom of Determinacy indicates a more specific notion of measurability, where the measure comes from the club filter.

Definition 2.6. $E_\omega^\kappa = \{\eta < \kappa : \text{cof}(\eta) = \omega\}$.

Definition 2.7 (Woodin, Def. 198 in [16]). *Let κ be an uncountable regular cardinal. We say that κ is ω -strongly measurable if there exists $\gamma < \kappa$ such that $2^\gamma < \kappa$ and there does not exist a sequence $\langle S_\alpha : \alpha < \gamma \rangle$ of pairwise disjoint subsets of κ such that for each $\alpha < \gamma$, S_α is stationary in E_ω^κ .*

Under the right conditions, an ω -strongly measurable is actually measurable:

Remark 2.8 (ZF + DC_γ). *If κ is ω -strongly measurable as witnessed by γ , then it is measurable.*

Sketch of proof. It is a standard procedure to prove that if there does not exist a sequence $\langle S_\alpha : \alpha < \gamma \rangle$ of pairwise disjoint subsets of κ such that for each $\alpha < \gamma$, S_α is stationary in E_ω^κ , then there exists a stationary set on which the ω -club filter is an ultrafilter:

If a stationary set cannot be split into two stationary sets (modulo a non-stationary set), then the ω -club filter is an ultrafilter on it. So suppose this never happens. Then by induction one can split κ in two stationary sets, then in four, and so on. For the limit case, one uses DC, and after γ steps a partition $\langle S_\alpha : \alpha < \gamma \rangle$ of stationary sets is created, and that is contradictory.

As the ω -club filter is κ -complete, the remark follows. $\square$

Another large cardinal that is expressible in a choiceless context is the Jónsson cardinal:

Definition 2.9. *A cardinal κ is Jónsson iff any structure for a countable first-order language with domain of cardinality κ has a proper elementary substructure with domain of the same cardinality.*

This concept is tightly connected to generic large cardinals:

Remark 2.10. *Let λ be a cardinal, G be generic for some forcing notion, $j : V \prec M \subseteq V[G]$, $j(\lambda) = \lambda$ and ${}^\lambda M \subseteq M$. Then λ is Jónsson.*

Proof. Suppose not. Then there exists some structure $\mathcal{U} = (U, \in, \dots)$ such that $|U| = \lambda$ and $\mathcal{U}$ has no elementary substructure with domain of cardinality λ . By elementarity, since λ is a fixed point of j , in M the same is true for $j(\mathcal{U}) = (j(U), \in, \dots)$. But consider $j''\mathcal{U}$. As ${}^\lambda M \subseteq M$, $j''\mathcal{U} \in M$, and $j''\mathcal{U} \prec j(\mathcal{U})$, this is a contradiction. $\square$

3 Definition of generic I0

As it is usual for generic large cardinals, the concept of "generic I0" is very vague. It implies that the generic large cardinal should be similar to I0, i.e., the existence of some embedding $j : L(\mathcal{P}(\kappa)) \prec L(\mathcal{P}(\kappa))^{V[G]}$, but this is not enough to characterize it, as different κ 's and variations on how similar is $V[G]$ to V produce drastically different hypotheses. The first step will be to restrict ourselves to the case $\kappa = \aleph_\omega$, we are going to call it "generic I0 holds at $\aleph_\omega$ ". Then we indicate other properties that state that $V[G]$ is close enough to V (the closer it is, the harder it is for it to be consistent, but also there are more interesting consequences). This choice has of course some arbitrariness: it is possible for different kind of closures to be fruitful, so the definition in all its details should be considered limited to this paper. But every point of the following definition has a reason to be there for the purpose of the paper, and the rest of the section is dedicated to the explanation of such reasons.

Definition 3.1. *Suppose GCH below $\aleph_\omega$. We say that generic I0 holds at $\aleph_\omega$ if there exists a forcing notion $\mathbb{P}$ and a generic G such that:*

1. $\mathbb{P} \in L(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))$ and in $L(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))$ there exists $\pi : \mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega) \twoheadrightarrow \mathbb{P}$;
2. $\aleph_\omega^V = \aleph_\omega^{V[G]}$;

3. every element of $\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega)^{V[G]}$ has a name (coded) in $\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega)$;
4. in $V[G]$ there exists $j : L(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega)) \prec L(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))[G]$;
5. there is a $\mathbb{P}$ -term for $H^{V^\mathbb{P}}(\aleph_\omega)$ and $j \restriction H(\aleph_\omega) : H(\aleph_\omega) \prec H^{V^\mathbb{P}}(\aleph_\omega)$.

The first point that could be controversial is (4). We expect generic I0 to be of the form $j : L(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega)) \prec L(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))^{V[G]}$. But it is a consequence:

Lemma 3.2. *Suppose that generic I0 holds at $\aleph_\omega$ and let $\mathbb{P}$ witness that. Then for any G $\mathbb{P}$ -generic $(L(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega)))^{V[G]} = L(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))[G]$.*

Proof. By Definition 3.1(3), $\mathcal{P}^{V[G]}(\aleph_\omega) = (\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))^{V[G]}$. Naturally $L(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega)) \models V = L(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))$, therefore by elementarity $L(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))[G] \models V = L(\mathcal{P}(j(\aleph_\omega)))$. By Definition 3.1(2) $j(\aleph_\omega) = \aleph_\omega$. Then

$$L(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))[G] = L(\mathcal{P}^{V[G]}(\aleph_\omega)) = (L(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega)))^{V[G]}$$

□

Notice that $L(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))[G]$ is a ZF-model that contains $\mathcal{P}^{V[G]}(\aleph_\omega)$, therefore trivially

$$(L(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega)))^{V[G]} = L(\mathcal{P}^{V[G]}(\aleph_\omega)) \subseteq L(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))[G],$$

so only one direction of the proof is not trivial. The problem is whether $\mathcal{P}^V(\aleph_\omega)$ is constructible over $\mathcal{P}^{V[G]}(\aleph_\omega)$ in $L(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))[G]$ or not. So the definition of generic I0 with $L(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))[G]$ is slightly stronger then with $(L(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega)))^{V[G]}$. It is not much stronger, for example assuming ω -closure is enough to make them equivalent:

Lemma 3.3. *Let $\mathbb{P}$ be a forcing notion on $L(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))$ that satisfies Definition 3.1(1), (2), (3) and is ω -closed. Then for any G $\mathbb{P}$ -generic $(L(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega)))^{V[G]} = L(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))[G]$.*

Proof. Let G be generic, $a \in (L(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega)))^{V[G]}$, and τ a name for a . Then there exists $b = \sigma_G \in \mathcal{P}^{V[G]}(\aleph_\omega)$ such that a is constructible from b . But then τ is constructible from σ . By Definition 3.1(3) we can choose $\sigma \in \mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega)$, therefore $a \in L(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))[G]$.

On the other hand, let G be generic for $\mathbb{P}$. By Definition 3.1(1), $G \subseteq \mathcal{P}^{V[G]}(\aleph_\omega)$. As $\mathbb{P}$ is ω -closed, we can define

$$\mathcal{P}^V(\aleph_\omega) = \{a \in \mathcal{P}^{V[G]}(\aleph_\omega) : \forall n \in \omega \ a \cap \aleph_n \in V\}.$$

This is because if $a \cap \aleph_n = a_n \in V$, then $\langle a_n : n \in \omega \rangle \in V$, and $a = \bigcup_{n \in \omega} a_n \in V$. So $L(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))[G] \subseteq L(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))^{V[G]}$. □

So why using this slightly stronger definition of generic I0? It is just a technical matter: thanks to the lifting lemma, $L(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))[G]$ maintains the ‘reflection structure’ of $L(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))$, and this is central in the proofs. It would be interesting to prove the same with the weaker version of generic I0.

Remark 3.4. *Let γ such that $\mathbb{P} \in L_\gamma(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))$, and η such that $\mathcal{P}^V(\aleph_\omega) \in (L_\eta(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega)))^{V[G]}$.*

1. For any α , if $\alpha = \gamma + \omega \cdot \alpha$ then $L_\alpha(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))^{V[G]} = L_\alpha(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))[G]$.

2. If $L_\alpha(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega)) \prec L_\beta(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))$, $\alpha = \gamma + \omega \cdot \alpha$ and $\beta = \gamma + \omega \cdot \beta$, then

$$L(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))[G] \models L_\alpha(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega)) \prec L_\beta(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega)).$$

3. If

$$L(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))[G] \models L_\alpha(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega)) \prec L_\beta(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega)),$$

$\alpha = \gamma + \omega \cdot \alpha$, $\beta = \gamma + \omega \cdot \beta$ and $\eta \leq \alpha$, then $L_\alpha(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega)) \prec L_\beta(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))$

Proof. 1. By 3.1(3) we have $\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega)[G] = \mathcal{P}^{V[G]}(\aleph_\omega)$, and it is a straightforward calculation by induction on the construction that every element of $L_\alpha(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))^{L(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))}$ has a name in $L_{\gamma+\omega \cdot \alpha}(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))$.

2. By the usual lifting lemma, using Definition 3.1(1), $L_\alpha(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))[G] \prec L_\beta(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))[G]$. By the previous point this implies the conclusion.

3. As $\mathcal{P}^V(\aleph_\omega) \in L_\alpha(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))^{V[G]}$,

$$L_\alpha(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega)) = (L(\mathcal{P}^V(\aleph_\omega)))^{L_\alpha(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))[G]},$$

by absoluteness of the constructible universe, and the conclusion is immediate. $\square$

All the other requirements have the effect of making the generic I0 more similar to the real one. For example, it is a fundamental point for I0 that $j(\lambda) = \lambda$, and because of point 2 $j(\aleph_\omega) = \aleph_\omega$ (this will also be crucial to prove the Jónsson-ness of key cardinals). Point 1 gives even more:

Lemma 3.5. *Suppose generic I0 at $\aleph_\omega$. Then $\Theta^{V[G]} = \Theta$ and $j(\Theta) = \Theta$.*

Proof. Let $X = \mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega)^V$. Suppose not, so there exists a $p \in \mathbb{P}$ and a name τ such that $p \Vdash \tau : \hat{X} \rightarrow \hat{\Theta}$. Then define (in V) $e : \mathbb{P} \times \mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega) \rightarrow \Theta$ as $e(q, a) = \alpha$ iff $q \Vdash \tau(a) = \alpha$. But then e is a surjection: for every $\beta < \Theta$ there exists $a \in \mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega)$ and $q \leq p$ such that $q \Vdash \tau(a) = \beta$. By Definition 3.1(1), this induces a surjection $e^+ : \mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega) \twoheadrightarrow \Theta$, contradiction. $\square$

I0 is a strengthening of I1, that is $j : V_{\lambda+1} \prec V_{\lambda+1}$: as already noticed, point 3 of the definition reflects this, as it implies that $\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega)^{L(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))[G]} = \mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega)[G]$ (and this makes sense because of point 1). Finally, point 5 is there to give the necessary amenability for j , that in I0 is for free:

Lemma 3.6. *Suppose that generic I0 holds at $\aleph_\omega$ and let G and j witness that. Then for unbounded (for all) $\alpha < \Theta$, $j \restriction L_\alpha(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega)) \in L(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))[G]$.*

Proof. By Lemma 2.5, we can assume that α is good. Then j is defined only by its behavior on $\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega)$, that in turn is defined by its behavior on $H(\aleph_\omega)$, because

$$j(a) = j\left(\bigcup_{n \in \omega} (a \cap \aleph_n)\right) = \bigcup_{n \in \omega} j(a \cap \aleph_n).$$

By Definition 3.1(5) $j \restriction H(\aleph_\omega) \in L(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))[G]$, and therefore this is true also for $j \restriction L_\alpha(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))$. $\square$

4 Consequences of generic I0

Let us recall the theorem that summarizes the consequences of generic I0 at $\aleph_\omega$:

Theorem 4.1. *Suppose that generic I0 holds at $\aleph_\omega$. Then $\aleph_\omega$ is Jónsson. Moreover, in $L(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))$:*

- $\aleph_{\omega+1}$ is ω -strongly measurable and Jónsson;
- Θ is "inaccessible", in the sense that it is regular and if $\alpha < \Theta$ then there is a surjection from $\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega)$ to $\mathcal{P}(\alpha)$;
- Θ is limit of ω -strongly measurable cardinals.

By Remark 2.10 is immediate to see that in $L(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))$ $\aleph_\omega$ and $\aleph_{\omega+1}$ are Jónsson. But the definition of $\aleph_\omega$ Jónsson involves only elements in $\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega)$, therefore $\aleph_\omega$ is Jónsson also in V .

Proposition 4.2. *Suppose that I0 holds at $\aleph_\omega$. Then $\aleph_{\omega+1}$ is ω -strongly measurable in $L(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))$.*

It will be witnessed by $\gamma = \text{crt}(j)$. As $L(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega)) \models \text{DC}_{\text{crt}(j)}$ by Remark 2.2, this will imply that $\aleph_{\omega+1}$ is measurable in $L(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))$.

Proof. We prove that $E_\omega^{\aleph_{\omega+1}}$ cannot be partitioned in $\text{crt}(j)$ stationary sets. As $\aleph_\omega$ is strong limit, this suffices to prove the Proposition. Suppose not, and fix $\langle S_\alpha : \alpha < \text{crt}(j) \rangle$ a partition of $E_\omega^{\aleph_{\omega+1}}$ in $\text{crt}(j)$ stationary sets. Then

$$j(\langle S_\alpha : \alpha < \text{crt}(j) \rangle) = \langle T_\alpha : \alpha < j(\text{crt}(j)) \rangle$$

is a partition of $(E_\omega^{\aleph_{\omega+1}})^{V[G]}$ into $j(\text{crt}(j))$ stationary sets. Consider $D = \{\alpha < \aleph_\omega^+ : j(\alpha) = \alpha\}$. By Lemma 3.6, as $j \upharpoonright L_{\lambda^+}(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega)) \in L(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))[G]$, $D \in L(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))[G]$. It is surely an ω -club, therefore there exists $\eta \in D \cap T_{\text{crt}(j)}$. But there must be some α such that $\eta \in S_\alpha$, and so $\eta = j(\eta) \in T_{j(\alpha)}$, contradiction. $\square$

The rest of Theorem 4.1 deals with ordinals under Θ . The following lemma will be therefore very useful:

Lemma 4.3. $\{\alpha < \Theta : j(\alpha) = \alpha\}$ is cofinal in Θ .

Proof. Let

$$U = \{X \subseteq \mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega) : (H(\aleph_\omega), j \upharpoonright H(\aleph_\omega)) \in j(X)\}.$$

By Definition 3.1(5) U is definable in $L(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))[G]$. The proof works as Lemma 5 in [17], in that we prove that the embedding j is close enough to a (generic) ultrapower embedding, that is easier to work with. The main innovation in [17] is the proof of Los' Theorem: in $L(V_{\lambda+1})$ there is no Axiom of Choice, so it must be proven from scratch. Here the situation is the same, but the proof of Los' Theorem is slightly different, as here the same "reflection trick" is not possible, and we must create one ad hoc.

The obstacle to prove Los' Theorem without AC is in proving that if

$$\{z \in \mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega) : L(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega)) \models \exists y \varphi(f_1(x), \dots, f_n(x))\} \in U,$$

then there exists a function $g : \mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega) \rightarrow L(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))$ such that

$$\{x \in V_{\lambda+1} : L(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega)) \models \varphi(g(x), f_1(x), \dots, f_n(x))\} \in U.$$

This is equivalent to prove that for each $f : \mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega) \rightarrow L(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega)) \setminus \emptyset$ there exists a $g : \mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega) \rightarrow L(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega)) \setminus \emptyset$ such that $\{x \in \mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega) : g(x) \in f(x)\} \in U$. Since in $L(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))$ everything is definable from an ordinal and elements in $\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega)$, it suffices to prove it for f such that for any $a \in \mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega)$, $f(s) \subseteq \mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega)$. For more details about this procedure, see [?].

Claim 4.4. *For any $b \in \mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega)$, there exists a $g : \mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega) \rightarrow L(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega)) \setminus \emptyset$ such that $j(g)((H(\aleph_\omega), j \upharpoonright H(\aleph_\omega))) = b$.*

Proof of Claim. Let

$$g(x) = \begin{cases} c & \text{if } x = (N, k), N \subseteq H(\aleph_\omega), k : N \prec H(\aleph_\omega), k(c) = b \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Then

$$j(g)(x) = \begin{cases} c & \text{if } x = (N, k), N \subseteq H(\aleph_\omega)[G], k : N \prec H(\aleph_\omega)[G], k(c) = j(b) \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

therefore $j(g)((H(\aleph_\omega), j \upharpoonright H(\aleph_\omega))) = b$, because j is injective. $\square$

In particular, b can be an element of $j(f)((H(\aleph_\omega), j \upharpoonright H(\aleph_\omega)))$, therefore Los' Theorem is proved.

The ultrapower construction therefore does yield an elementary embedding, we call it k , and the following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} L(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega)) & \xrightarrow{j} & L(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))[G] \\ & \searrow k & \uparrow h \\ & & \text{Ult}(L(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega)), U) \end{array}$$

where $h([f]) = j(f)((H(\aleph_\omega), j \upharpoonright H(\aleph_\omega)))$. By Claim 4.4, $h'' \text{Ult}(L(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega)), U) \supseteq \mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega)$, and therefore the critical point of h is bigger than Θ . Therefore $j \upharpoonright L_\Theta(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega)) = k \upharpoonright L_\Theta(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))$.

Now it is the same as [17]. It is standard to prove that every strong limit cardinal with large cofinality is a fixed point of k , so the class of fixed points I is cofinal in Ord, and therefore every element of $L(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))$ is defined from elements of $I \cup \mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega)$: if not, the inverse of the collapse of the Skolem closure of $I \cup \mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega)$ would be a non-trivial elementary embedding, but the critical point would be so large that it would be in I , and that is a contradiction.

So any ordinal $\beta < \Theta$ is definable from some elements of $I \cup \mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega)$, say $\{i_0, \dots, i_n\} \in I$. Then the collapse of the Skolem closure Z of $\{i_0, \dots, i_n\} \cup \mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega)$ is, by condensation, some $L_\gamma(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))$, but $\gamma > \beta$ because $\beta \in Z$, $\gamma < \Theta$ because there is a surjection from $\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega)$ to Z , and $\gamma \in I$ because $k(Z) = Z$. Therefore the fixed points of k are cofinal in Θ . As

$$j \restriction L_\Theta(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega)) = k \restriction L_\Theta(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega)),$$

also the fixed points of j are cofinal in Θ . $\square$

Theorem 4.5. Θ is "inaccessible" in $L(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))$, in the sense that it is regular and if $\alpha < \Theta$ then there is a surjection from $\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega)$ to $\mathcal{P}(\alpha)$.

Lemma 4.6 (Weak Coding Lemma). *Suppose generic $I0$ for $\aleph_\omega$, witnessed by $j, \mathbb{P}$. Let η such that $\mathbb{P} \in L_\eta(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))$. Then in $L(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))$, for all $\kappa < \Theta$ and for all $\pi : \mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega) \rightarrow \kappa$ $\exists \gamma < \Theta$ such that $\forall X \subseteq \mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega)$ if $\{\xi : \pi^{-1}(\xi) \cap X \neq \emptyset\} = \kappa$, then $\exists Y \subseteq X$, $Y \in L_\gamma(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))$ such that $\{\xi : \pi^{-1}(\xi) \cap Y \neq \emptyset\}$ is cofinal in κ .*

Proof. We introduce some notation, to make the proof more readable.

If $X \subseteq \mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega)$, $X \in L(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))$, we say that X is π -unbounded (in κ) if $\{\xi : \pi^{-1}(\xi) \cap X \neq \emptyset\}$ is cofinal in κ . So the Weak Coding Lemma says that for any π surjection of $\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega)$ to some ordinal there exists a γ such that any π -unbounded set has a subset that is in $L_\gamma(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))$ (therefore less complex) that it is still π -unbounded.

Suppose not, i.e., there exist $\kappa, \pi : \mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega) \rightarrow \kappa$, such that $\forall \gamma < \Theta \exists X \subseteq \mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega)$ π -unbounded such that $\forall Y \subseteq X$, $Y \in L_\gamma(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))$ Y is π -bounded. We just write NWCL^κ to indicate this and underline the role of κ .

Now we want to fix κ .

Claim 4.7. *Let $\pi : \mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega) \rightarrow \kappa$, let $X \subseteq \mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega)$ π -unbounded. Then if there exists a $Y \in L_\gamma(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))[G]$, with γ limit and $\mathbb{P} \in L_\gamma(\aleph_\omega)$, such that Y is π -unbounded and $Y \subseteq X$, then there exists $Y^* \in L_\gamma(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))$ that satisfies the same.*

Proof. Let $p \in G$ and $\tau \in L_\gamma(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))$ such that $p \models \tau = Y \wedge Y \subseteq X$. Define

$$Y^* = \{a \in \mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega) : \exists q \leq p \ q \models a \in \tau\}.$$

Then $Y^* \in L_\gamma(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))$ and $Y \subseteq Y^* \subseteq X$, therefore

$$\{\xi : \pi^{-1}(\xi) \cap Y^* \neq \emptyset\} \supseteq \{\xi : \pi^{-1}(\xi) \cap Y \neq \emptyset\}$$

is cofinal in κ . $\square$

An immediate consequence of Claim 4.7 is that if NWCL^κ does not hold in $L(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))[G]$, then it does not hold directly in $L(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))$: Suppose NWCL^κ does not hold in $L(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))[G]$ and it holds in $L(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))$. Then there exists $\pi : \mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega) \rightarrow \kappa$, such that $\forall \gamma < \Theta \exists X \subseteq \mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega)$ π -unbounded such that $\forall Y \subseteq X$, $Y \in L_\gamma(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))$, Y is π -bounded. Fix π and X . We can trivially extend π to $\pi^* : \mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega)[G] \rightarrow \kappa$. Then, by $(\neg \text{NWCL}^\kappa)^{L(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))[G]}$, there exists $Y \subseteq X$, $Y \in L_\gamma(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))[G]$ π -unbounded. But by Claim 4.7 we can suppose $Y \in L_\gamma(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))$, and this is a contradiction.

Now let κ_0 be the least such that NWCL^{κ_0} holds.

Claim 4.8. $j(\kappa_0) = \kappa_0$.

Proof. Suppose not, then $\kappa_0 < j(\kappa_0)$. As $j(\kappa_0)$ is minimal in $L(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))[G]$, this means that NWCL^{κ_0} does not hold in $L(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))[G]$. But then by Claim 4.7 it does not hold in $L(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))$. Contradiction. $\square$

Now let us drop the superscript and write NWCL instead of NWCL^{κ_0} . The free parameters in NWCL are ω and κ_0 , all fixed points of j . By definition of κ_0 , NWCL is true. As all the sets involved are subsets of $\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega)$, or codeable as such, NWCL is true in $L_\Theta(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))$.

Let

$$\Gamma = \{\alpha < \Theta : L_\alpha(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega)) \prec L_\Theta(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))\}.$$

Then by Remark 3.4 Γ and $\Gamma^{L(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))[G]}$ have the same tail. Using Lemma 4.3, fix a $\delta < \Theta$, $\delta > \kappa, \eta$ that it is a fixed point of j and so that

$$\Gamma \cap [\delta, \Theta] = \Gamma^{L(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))[G]} \cap [\delta, \Theta] = \Gamma'.$$

Fix an enumeration of $\Gamma' = \langle \gamma_\alpha : \alpha < \Theta \rangle$. Note that $\Gamma' = j(\Gamma')$ and $j(\gamma_\alpha) = \gamma_{j(\alpha)}$.

As NWCL is true in $L_\Theta(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))$, by elementarity it is also true in all $L_\gamma(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))$, for $\gamma \in \Gamma'$. Therefore NWCL is true in $L_{\gamma_{\text{crt}(j)+1}}(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))$. Fix $\pi : \mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega) \rightarrow \kappa_0$, and let $X \subseteq \mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega)$ be π -unbounded and such that all $Y \subseteq X$, $Y \in L_{\gamma_{\text{crt}(j)}}(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))$ are π -bounded, with $\pi, X \in L_{\gamma_{\text{crt}(j)+1}}(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))$. Then $j(X)$ is $j(\pi)$ -unbounded, and all the $Y \subseteq X$, $Y \in L_{\gamma_{j(\text{crt}(j))}}(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))[G]$ are $j(\pi)$ -bounded. But consider $j''X$: it is a subset of $j(X)$, it is defined from X and $j \upharpoonright H(\aleph_\omega)$, and therefore is in $L_{\gamma_{\text{crt}(j)+1+1}}(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))[G]$. As $\text{crt}(j) + 1 < j(\text{crt}(j))$, $\gamma_{\text{crt}(j)+1} < \gamma_{j(\text{crt}(j))}$ and therefore $\gamma_{\text{crt}(j)+1} + 1 \leq \gamma_{j(\text{crt}(j))}$, so $j''X \in L_{\gamma_{j(\text{crt}(j))}}(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))[G]$. But $j''\kappa_0$ is cofinal in κ_0 , therefore $j''X$ is $j(\pi)$ -unbounded, contradiction. $\square$

Lemma 4.9 (Coding Lemma). *Suppose generic I0 for $\aleph_\omega$, witnessed by $\mathbb{P}$. Then in $L(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))$, for all $\kappa < \Theta$ and for all $\pi : \mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega) \rightarrow \kappa$ $\exists \gamma_0$ such that $\forall X \subseteq \mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega)$, $\exists Y \subseteq X$, $Y \in L_{\gamma_0}(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))$ such that*

$$\{\xi : \pi^{-1}(\xi) \cap Y \neq \emptyset\} = \{\xi : \pi^{-1}(\xi) \cap X \neq \emptyset\}.$$

Proof. Proving the Coding Lemma from the Weak Coding Lemma is standard (see for example the proof of Lemma 22 in [17], pages 149–150), and does not need generic I0.

Let $\pi : \mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega) \rightarrow \kappa$, and suppose by induction that the Weak Coding Lemma holds for all $\pi' : \mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega) \rightarrow \alpha$ with $\alpha < \kappa$. Let τ be a bijection between $\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega)$ and $\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega) \times \mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega)$, and let $\pi^* : \mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega) \rightarrow \kappa$ be $\pi \circ \tau_1$ (therefore if $\tau(x) = (a, b)$ then $\pi^*(x) = \pi(a)$). For any $\alpha < \kappa$ fix a $\pi_\alpha : \mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega) \rightarrow \alpha$, and a γ_α that witnesses the Coding Lemma for π_α and fix a γ_κ that witnesses the Weak Coding Lemma for π^* . Let $\beta_0 = \sup_{\alpha \leq \kappa} \gamma_\alpha$: As Θ is regular, $\beta_0 < \Theta$, therefore there exists $\rho : \mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega) \rightarrow L_{\beta_0}(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))$. Let $\rho, \tau \in L_\beta(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))$. Then $\beta + 1$ witnesses the Coding Lemma for π .

Let $X \subseteq \mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega)$. Consider

$$A = \{x \in \mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega) : \rho(\tau_2(x)) \text{ witnesses the Coding Lemma for } \pi_{\pi^*(x)}, X\}.$$

In other words, A is the set of all (α, Y) such that Y satisfies the Coding Lemma for π_α and X , but coded as a subset of $\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega)$. Then, by the Weak Coding

Lemma, there exists a $B \in L_{\gamma\kappa}(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))$, $B \subseteq A$ such that B is π^* -unbounded. Then let $Y = \bigcup \{\rho(\tau_2(x)) : x \in B\}$. Clearly $Y \in L_{\beta+1}(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))$.

Suppose there exists an $x \in X$ such that $\pi(x) = \gamma$. We must find a $y \in Y$ such that $\pi(y) = \gamma$. As B is π^* -unbounded, there exists an $\alpha > \gamma$ and a $z \in B$ such that $\pi^*(z) = \alpha$. As $B \subseteq A$, this means that $\rho(\tau_2(z))$ witnesses the Coding Lemma for $\pi_{\pi^*(z)} = \pi_\alpha$. Therefore there exists a $y \in \rho(\tau_2(z))$ such that $\pi(y) = \gamma$, and $y \in Y$. $\square$

Proof of Theorem 4.5. Let $\alpha < \Theta$ and $A \subseteq \alpha$. Fix a $\pi : \mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega) \rightarrow \alpha$, $\pi \in L_\beta(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))$ and let $\gamma \geq \beta$ witness the Coding Lemma for π . Let $X = \pi^{-1}[A]$. Then, by the Coding Lemma, there exists $Y \in L_\gamma(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))$, $Y \subseteq X$ such that $\pi[Y] = A$. But then $A \in L_\gamma(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))$.

Therefore $\mathcal{P}(\alpha) \subseteq L_\gamma(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))$, and as there is a surjection from $\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega)$ to $L_\gamma(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))$, the theorem is proved. $\square$

Theorem 4.10. Θ is limit of ω -strongly measurable cardinals.

Proof. Fix an α such that $j(\alpha) = \alpha$ and $\mathbb{P} \in L_\alpha(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))$, and let κ be the least ordinal bigger than α such that $L_\kappa(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega)) \prec_1 L_\Theta(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))$. Then, using remark 3.4, $j(\kappa) = \kappa$. We will prove that κ is an ω -strongly measurable cardinal, and by Lemma 4.3 the arbitrariness of α will prove the theorem.

Define $\Theta^{L_\kappa(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))}$ as the supremum of the ordinals α such that there is a surjection $\rho : \mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega) \rightarrow \alpha$ such that $\{(a, b) : \rho(a) < \rho(b)\} \in L_\kappa(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))$. By elementarity $\Theta^{L_\kappa(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))} = \kappa$. It is now tempting to dump all the information we have about Θ on κ , for example that Θ is regular or the Coding Lemma itself. But one must be cautious: Θ is not an element of $L_\Theta(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))$, therefore not all properties can be reflected (not regularity, for example), and the Coding Lemma has too high complexity. But it is possible to prove both, thanks to the analysis of stable ordinals that has been brought forward for $L(\mathbb{R})$.

Like in $L(\mathbb{R})$, there exists a $\Sigma_1(\alpha)$ partial map from $\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega)$ to $L_\kappa(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))$: As $L_\kappa(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega)) \models V = \text{HOD}_{\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega)}$, it is possible to build Σ_1 partial Skolem functions inside $L_\kappa(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))$, defining for any Σ_1 formula and any $a \in \mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega)$ $h_{\phi,a}(x)$ as the smallest element in OD_a that satisfies $\varphi(x)$. The closure of $\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega) \cup \alpha$ under such Skolem functions is a Σ_1 elementary substructure of $L_\Theta(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))$, and by condensation its collapse is some $L_\gamma(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))$, with $\gamma > \alpha$. But κ was the least one, so $\gamma = \kappa$. Therefore every element of $L_\kappa(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))$ is image of the collapse of some Skolem function, and coding φ , a and x in a unique element of $\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega)$ we have the $\Sigma_1(\alpha)$ partial surjection.

In the same way, more carefully, it is possible for any $\beta < \kappa$ to find in $L_\kappa(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))$ a total surjection from $\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega)$ to $L_\beta(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))$. Therefore, κ is actually the supremum of the $\Delta_1^2(\alpha)$ prewellorderings of $\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega)$ (the proof is the same as in Lemma 1.11 and Lemma 1.12 in [15]).

Lemma 4.11. Let $\rho : \mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega) \rightarrow L_\kappa(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))$ be a $\Sigma_1(\alpha)$ partial map. Then for every $Z \subseteq \text{dom}(\rho)$, $Z \in L_\kappa(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))$, $\rho \upharpoonright Z$ is bounded.

Proof. Let $Z \subseteq \text{dom}(\rho)$, $Z \in L_\kappa(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))$. Then Z is actually $\Delta_1^2(\alpha)$ from $\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega)$. We can build a $\Delta_1^2(\alpha)$ prewellordering on Z , connecting to any $z \in Z$ the least ordinal in the constructive hierarchy where $\rho(z)$ appears. Then $\rho \upharpoonright Z$ cannot be unbounded, otherwise there would be a $\Delta_1^2(\alpha)$ prewellordering of length κ . $\square$

We proved the following:

Lemma 4.12. *There exists a partial $\rho : \mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega) \rightarrow L_\kappa(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))$, $\Sigma_1(\alpha)$ -definable from $\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega)$, such that on every $Z \subseteq \text{dom}(\rho)$, $Z \in L_\kappa(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))$ ρ is bounded.*

In a similar fashion, we can prove that $\text{cof}(\kappa) > \aleph_\omega$: Suppose that there exists a cofinal sequence of length $< \aleph_\omega$ in κ . Then using $\text{DC}_{\aleph_\omega}$ for every element of the sequence one can choose a $\Delta_1^2(\alpha)$ prewellordering with such length, and glue them all together to form a $\Delta_1^2(\alpha)$ prewellordering of length κ , that is contradictory.

The Weak Coding Lemma in $L_\kappa(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))$ does not follow from elementarity, but it can be re-proved in the exact same way as in Lemma 4.6: It is essential that $\Theta^{L_\kappa(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))} = \kappa$, so that γ_α is defined, and since $\text{cof}(\kappa) > \aleph_\omega$ the sequence of γ_α is longer than $\aleph_\omega$, and therefore the contradiction with the existence of $\gamma_{\text{crt}(j)}$ holds.

Lemma 4.13. *κ is regular.*

Proof. It is similar to the proof of $\text{cof}(\kappa) > \aleph_\omega$, using the Weak Coding Lemma instead of $\text{DC}_{\aleph_\omega}$. Let $\beta = \text{cof}(\kappa)$ and pick a $f : \beta \rightarrow \kappa$ cofinal in κ . As $\Theta^{L_\kappa(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))} = \kappa$, there exists a surjection $\pi : \mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega) \rightarrow \beta$, with $\pi \in L_\kappa(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))$. Define $\pi' : \mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega) \rightarrow \beta$ as $\pi'(\langle a, b \rangle) = \pi(a)$ and let γ witness the Weak Coding Lemma in $L_\kappa(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))$ for π' . Then let

$$A = \{\langle a, b \rangle : b \in \text{dom}(\rho) \wedge \rho(b) = f(\pi(a))\}.$$

By the Weak Coding Lemma, there exists $B \in L_\gamma(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))$, $B \subseteq A$ such that B is π' -unbounded. By definition, this means that $\pi''(B)_0$ (the image under π of the projection of B in the first coordinate), is unbounded in β . Let

$$Z = (B)_1 = \{b : \exists a \in \mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega), \langle a, b \rangle \in B\}.$$

Then also Z is in $L_\gamma(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))$. But $\rho''Z \subseteq f \circ \pi''(B)_0$, and as $\pi''B$ is cofinal in β , $\rho''Z$ is unbounded in κ , and this contradict its boundedness as in Lemma 4.12. $\square$

Again, the proof of the Coding Lemma works now in $L_\kappa(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))$, the key points being that the Weak Coding Lemma holds in $L_\kappa(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))$ and that $\kappa = \Theta^{L_\kappa(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))}$ is regular (so that induction works). We have proved:

Lemma 4.14 (Coding Lemma in $L_\kappa(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))$). *In $L_\kappa(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))$, for all $\eta < \kappa$ and for all $\pi : \mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega) \rightarrow \eta$ $\exists \gamma_0$ such that $\forall X \subseteq \mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega)$, $\exists Y \subseteq X$, $Y \in L_{\gamma_0}(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))$ such that*

$$\{\xi : \pi^{-1}(\xi) \cap Y \neq \emptyset\} = \{\xi : \pi^{-1}(\xi) \cap X \neq \emptyset\}.$$

To prove the Theorem in the $L(V_{\lambda+1})$ case, now (see Lemma 22 in [17]), one takes the set of all the elementary embeddings from $L_\kappa(V_{\lambda+1})$ to itself, and the filter F_0 generated by the fixed points of such embeddings is a measure on κ . Unfortunately, this does not work in this setting: the problem is that in the I0 case one F_0 is both in the domain and the codomain of the j that witnesses I0, and it is a fixed point, and this helps in proving that F_0 is an ultrafilter on a stationary set, as in 4.2 (pick a partition of $\text{crt}(j)$ F_0 -positive sets, the image is a bigger partition, etc...). Then F_0 and the club filter F are the same on such stationary set, therefore the club filter is an ultrafilter on a stationary set. Finally, one proves that F_0 is κ -complete.

In the generic I0 case, instead, the filter

$$F_0 = \{k : L_\kappa(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega)) \prec L_\kappa(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))[G]\}$$

exists only in $V[G]$, and not in V . The objective, therefore, is to find a filter F'_0 in V such that $F_0 \subseteq j(F'_0) \subseteq F$, and proving that there exists a stationary set such that F'_0 is an ultrafilter on it. This will prove the same for F .

Let $N \subseteq H(\aleph_\omega)$. Then we define $\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega)_N$ in the same way we define $\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega)$ from $H(\aleph_\omega)$:

$$\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega)_N = \left\{ \bigcup_{n \in \omega} a_n : (\forall n \ a_n \subseteq \aleph_n \wedge a_n \in N) \wedge \forall n \leq m \ a_n \subseteq a_m \right\}.$$

Let $\mathcal{E}$ be the set of pairs (N, k) such that

- $N \subseteq H(\aleph_\omega)$, $N = (H(\aleph_\omega))^{L(N)}$;
- $k : N \prec H(\aleph_\omega)$;
- k induces an embedding $\bar{k} : L_\kappa(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega)_N) \prec L_\kappa(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))$;
- there exists $e : \mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega)_N \twoheadrightarrow \alpha$, $e \in L_\kappa(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega)_N)$, such that $\bar{k}(\alpha) = \alpha$.
- κ is the least such that $L_\kappa(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega)_N) \prec_1 L(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega)_N)$.

As before, κ is actually the supremum of the $\Delta_2^1(\alpha)$ prewellorderings of $\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega)_N$, and therefore for each $(N, k) \in \mathcal{E}$ we can also fix a ρ_N as in 4.12, i.e., a partial surjection from $\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega)_N$ to $L_\kappa(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega)_N)$ that is $\Sigma_1(\alpha)$ definable from $\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega)_N$ and bounded on all sets in $L_\kappa(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega)_N)$. As everything is definable (modulo α , but it is a fixed point), $\bar{k}(\rho_N) = \rho$.

Note that $(H(\aleph_\omega), j \upharpoonright H(\aleph_\omega)) \in j(\mathcal{E})$ (thanks to Definition 3.1(5) and by definition of κ), therefore $\mathcal{E} \neq \emptyset$.

For each $(N, k) \in \mathcal{E}$, let

$$C_{(N, k)} = \{\eta < \kappa : \text{cof}(\eta) = \omega, \bar{k}(\eta) = \eta\},$$

and for each $\sigma \subseteq \mathcal{E}$, $|\sigma| \leq \aleph_\omega$, let $C_\sigma = \bigcap_{(N, k) \in \sigma} C_{(N, k)}$. Let F_0 the filter generated by the C_σ 's.

Claim 4.15. *There exists $T \subseteq E_\omega^\kappa$ such that $F_0 \upharpoonright T$ is an ultrafilter*

Proof of Claim. As in 4.2: Suppose that there exists a partition $\langle S_\xi, \xi < \text{crt}(j) \rangle$ of F_0 -positive sets. Then

$$j(\langle S_\xi, \xi < \text{crt}(j) \rangle) = \langle T_\xi, \xi < j(\text{crt}(j)) \rangle$$

is a partition of E_ω^κ in $j(F_0)$ -positive sets. By definition, $C_{(H(\aleph_\omega), j \upharpoonright H(\aleph_\omega))} \in j(F_0)$, therefore $T_{\text{crt}(j)} \cap C_{(H(\aleph_\omega), j \upharpoonright H(\aleph_\omega))} \neq \emptyset$. Let $\eta \in T_{\text{crt}(j)} \cap C_{(H(\aleph_\omega), j \upharpoonright H(\aleph_\omega))}$. There must be some $\xi < \text{crt}(j)$ such that $\eta \in S_\xi$. But then $\eta = j(\eta) \in T_\xi \cap T_{\text{crt}(j)}$, contradiction. By the proof of the Remark 2.8, using $\text{DC}_{\aleph_\omega}$ and the $\aleph_\omega$ -completeness of F_0 the Claim is proved. $\square$

Claim 4.16. *Let F' the club filter on E_ω^κ . Then $F_0 \upharpoonright T = F' \upharpoonright T$.*

Proof. It suffices to show that $F_0 \subseteq F'$: in this case, T is also stationary, so $F' \restriction T$ is a filter that extends $F_0 \restriction T$, and since this is an ultrafilter they must be equal.

Let $\sigma \subseteq \mathcal{E}$, $|\sigma| \leq \aleph_\omega$ then, we must prove that C_σ is an ω -club. For any $(N, k) \in \mathcal{E}$, by definition of $\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega)_N$ the function that associates (N, k) to $L_\kappa(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega)_N)$ is $\Sigma_1(\alpha)$ -definable from $\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega)$. Therefore the same is true for the function that associates (N, k) to $\bar{k}$. Now let, for any $\beta < \kappa$, $G_\beta(N, k) = \bar{k}(\beta)$. Clearly G_β is $\Sigma_1(\alpha)$ -definable from $\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega)$, and therefore by Lemma 4.11 G_β is bounded on σ , and therefore $\sup\{\bar{k}(\beta) : (N, k) \in \sigma\} < \kappa$.

Subclaim 4.17. *For every $(N, k) \in \mathcal{E}$, $L_\kappa(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega)_N)$ is closed under ω -sequences.*

Proof. It is a relativization to $L(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega)_N)$ of the fact that $\text{cof}(\kappa) > \aleph_\omega$. If $\langle a_n : n \in \omega \rangle$ is such that $a_n \in L_\kappa(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega)_N)$ for any $n \in \omega$, then each a_n is $\Delta_2^1(\alpha)$ from $\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega)_N$. Each a_n can be coded as a subset A_n of $\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega)_N$, so that the ω -sequence of the codes (that, in turn, can be coded as one subset A of $\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega)_N$) codes $\langle a_n : n \in \omega \rangle$. Then A is also $\Delta_2^1(\alpha)$, and therefore is in $L_\kappa(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega)_N)$. By developing the code, one can find $\langle a_n : n \in \omega \rangle$ in $L_\kappa(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega)_N)$. $\square$

Let $(N, k) \in \sigma$ and let $\beta_0 < \kappa$. Define $\beta_{n+1} = \sup_{(N, k) \in \sigma} G_{\beta_n}(N, k)$ and $\beta_\omega = \sup_{n \in \omega} \beta_n$. Then $\bar{k}(\beta_\omega) = \sup_{n \in \omega} \bar{k}(\beta_n) = \beta_\omega$. Therefore $\beta_\omega \in C_\sigma$ and C_σ is unbounded in κ .

As $L_\kappa(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega)_N)$ is closed under ω -sequences, it is trivial that C_σ is ω -closed. $\square$

Finally, we need to prove that $F_0 \restriction T$ is κ -complete. Then also $F' \restriction T$ will be κ -complete, and this will prove that κ is ω -strongly measurable.

Let $\langle A_\xi : \xi < \beta \rangle$ with $\beta < \kappa$ such that $A_\xi \subseteq T$ and $A_\xi \in F_0$. Note that each element of $\mathcal{E}$ can be coded as an element of $\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega)$, and the same is true for ω -sequences of elements of $\mathcal{E}$. Fix therefore a surjection $G : \mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega) \rightarrow \mathcal{E}^{\aleph_\omega}$, and for any $a \in \mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega)$ write $C_{G(a)}$ simply as C_a .

Fix a surjection $\pi : \mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega) \rightarrow \beta$ (remember that $\kappa = \Theta^{L_\kappa(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))}$), a bijection $\tau : \mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega) \times \mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega)$ and let $\pi' = \pi \circ \tau_1$. Let η witness the Coding Lemma in $L_\kappa(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))$ for π' , as in Lemma 4.14. Let

$$A = \{a \in \mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega) : C_{\tau_2(a)} \subseteq A_{\pi'(a)}\}.$$

Since for all $\xi < \beta$ $A_\xi \in F_0$, each A_ξ contains some C_b , therefore $\pi'[A] = \beta$. Then there exists a $B \subseteq A$ that is in $L_\eta(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))$ and such that $\pi'[B] = \beta$.

Let $\mathcal{E}_B = \bigcup\{G(\tau_2(a)) : a \in B\}$, and let

$$W_\delta = \{\bar{k}(a) : (N, k) \in \mathcal{E}_B, \rho_N(a) = \delta\}.$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} \rho''W_\delta &= \{\rho(\bar{k}(a)) : (N, k) \in \mathcal{E}_B, \rho_N(a) = \delta\} \\ &= \{\bar{k}(\rho_N(a)) : (N, k) \in \mathcal{E}_B, \rho_N(a) = \delta\} \\ &= \{\bar{k}(\delta) : (N, k) \in \mathcal{E}_B\}. \end{aligned}$$

As W_δ is in $L_\kappa(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))$, by the boundedness of ρ (4.12) $\rho''W_\delta$ is bounded for any δ . Now iterate the process as in 4.15 to find a δ_ω that is a fixed point for

all the k 's such that $(N, k) \in \mathcal{E}_B$, and therefore $\delta_\omega \in C_{(N, k)}$. In other words, for any $a \in B$, $\delta_\omega \in C_{\tau_2(a)}$.

But for every $a \in B$ $C_{\tau_2(a)} \subseteq A_{\pi'(a)}$, and therefore $\delta_\omega \in A_{\pi'(a)}$. As $\pi'[B] = \beta$, δ_ω is in all the A_ξ 's, and therefore the intersection of all the A_ξ 's is not empty, and therefore $F_0 \upharpoonright T$ is κ -complete.

□

5 Open problems

The most obvious question is of course:

Open Problem 5.1. *Is generic I0 at $\aleph_\omega$ consistent under large cardinals?*

But this is not the only direction that the research can follow. Consider in general $L(\mathcal{P}(\lambda))$. One of the key points in the paper is that $L(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega)) \not\models \text{AC}$. One can ask for which λ 's is true that $L(\mathcal{P}(\lambda)) \not\models \text{AC}$. Such question is non trivial only when λ is singular, as it is easy to achieve when λ is regular via forcing. But:

Theorem 5.2 (Shelah, [13]). *If λ is singular with uncountable cofinality, then $L(\mathcal{P}(\lambda)) \models \text{AC}$.*

Therefore it makes sense only for λ 's of cofinality ω . Now, under AD $L(\mathcal{P}(\omega)) \not\models \text{AC}$. If I0 holds at λ then $L(\mathcal{P}(\lambda)) \not\models \text{AC}$. And if generic I0 holds at $\aleph_\omega$ then $L(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega)) \not\models \text{AC}$. Are there other possibilities?

Open Problem 5.3. *For which λ 's is true that $L(\mathcal{P}(\lambda)) \not\models \text{AC}$?*

Another way to push forward the research on generic I0 would be to exploit the many results we already have on I0. For example, in [2] the inverse limits method is developed. In the generic I0 case is more difficult, as the original inverse limits method uses the fact that domain and codomain of the elementary embedding are the same, but it is possible to reflect the codomain inside the domain, as it is done in the proof of 4.3.

Open Problem 5.4. *Is there an inverse limit for generic I0?*

Or one can investigate the degree structure of $L(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))$, as it is done in [14] for I0.

Open Problem 5.5. *How is $L(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))$ under generic I0 at $\aleph_\omega$? Does Degree Determinacy hold?*

The fact that in 4.3 is proven that j can come from an ideal opens the possibility of defining proper and non-proper elementary embeddings. Those were introduced in [17] and extensively studied in [4] and [5] for hypotheses stronger than I0.

Open Problem 5.6. *How a generic E_α^0 could be defined? Does it exist a non-proper elementary embedding in such a setting?*

Finally:

Open Problem 5.7. *Is it possible to have generic I0 and $2^{\aleph_\omega} > \aleph_{\omega+1}$ in V ?*

(This was studied in [6] and [7] for I_0).

Acknowledgments. The paper was developed thanks to the generous financial support of the FWF (Austrian Science Fund) through projects M 1514-N25 and P 27815-N25, and also under the Italian program "Rita Levi Montalcini 2013". The author wants to thank the Kurt Godel Research Center, the Institute of Discrete Mathematics and Geometry at Technische Universität Wien and the Department of Mathematical, Computer and Physical Sciences at University of Udine for their hospitality, and the Department of Mathematics at Harvard University for the invitation that kickstarted this work.

This paper would not exist without the invaluable help of Hugh W. Woodin, whose input was the foundation of the entire project. The author would also like to thank Rachid Atmai, Scott Cramer, Sakae Fuchino, Mohammed Golshani, Daisuke Ikegami, Toshimichi Usuba, Liuzhen Wu for the many meaningful discussions, that helped to shape this work.

References

- [1] A. W. Apter, *Successors of singular cardinals and measurability*. Advances in Mathematics, **55** (1985) 228–241.
- [2] S. Cramer, *Inverse limit reflection and the structure of $L(V_{\lambda+1})$* . Journal of Mathematical Logic **15** (2015) 1–38.
- [3] V. Dimonte, *Introduction to I_0 : Elementary embeddings*, unpublished manuscript.
- [4] V. Dimonte, *Totally non-proper ordinals beyond $L(V_{\lambda+1})$* . Archive for Mathematical Logic **50** (2011) 565–584.
- [5] V. Dimonte, *A Partially Non-Proper Ordinal*. Annals of Pure and Applied Logic **163** (2012) 1309–1321.
- [6] V. Dimonte, S. Friedman, *Rank-into-rank hypotheses and the failure of GCH* . Archive for Mathematical Logic **53** (2014) 351–366.
- [7] V. Dimonte, L. Wu, *A general tool for consistency results related to I_1* . European Journal of Mathematics **2** (2016) 474–492.
- [8] M. Foreman, *Large cardinals and strong model theoretic transfer properties*. Transactions of the American Mathematical Society, *272* (1982) 427–463.
- [9] R. Laver, *Reflection of elementary embedding axioms on the $L[V_{\lambda+1}]$ hierarchy*. Annals of Pure and Applied Logic **107** (2001), 227–238.
- [10] T. J. Jech, K.L. Prikry, *On ideals of sets and the power set operation*. Bulletin of the American Mathematical Society, **82** (1976) 593–595.
- [11] A. Kanamori, *The Higher Infinite. Large cardinals in set theory from their beginnings. Second edition*. Springer Monographs in Mathematics. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2003.
- [12] S. Shelah, *Cardinal Arithmetic*. Oxford Logic Guides, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1994.

- [13] S. Shelah, *PCF without choice*. ArXiv e-prints, (2010), [Sh:835].
arXiv:math/0510229.
- [14] X. Shi, *Axiom I_0 and higher degree theory*. Journal of Symbolic Logic **80**
(2015) 970–1021.
- [15] J. Steel, *Scales in $L(\mathbb{R})$* . Cabal Seminar 79–81, 107–156, Lecture Notes in
Mathematics, 1019, Springer, Berlin, 1983.
- [16] W. H. Woodin, *Suitable extender models I*. Journal of Mathematical Logic,
10 (2010) 101–339.
- [17] W. H. Woodin, *Suitable extender models II: beyond ω -huge*. Journal of
Mathematical Logic, **11** (2011) 115–436.